REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 12, 14-19 are pending, wherein claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10 and 12 have been amended, and claims 14-19 have been added. Claims 3-5, 9, 11 and 13 have been canceled.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of Applicant's claim for foreign priority, and that all of the certified copies of the priority document have been received. Applicant also appreciates the Examiner's consideration of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 19, 2004 and June 7, 2005.

The Specification is objected to for minor informalities. Accordingly, the Specification has been amended to correct the spelling error on page 2, and the reference designator errors on pages 8 and 9 as requested in the Office Action. The requested change was not, however, made to page 10, line 7, because Applicant respectfully submits that the text of the Specification is correct when it states that "arithmetic processing unit 34 acts as a surrogate for the arithmetic processing unit 21." Applicant has, however, amended this sentence to reference the figure numbers of the figures containing each of the arithmetic processing units.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,427,115 to Sekiyama ("Sekiyama"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sekiyama does not anticipate Applicant's claim 1, as amended, because Sekiyama does not disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 1. For example, Sekiyama does not disclose that "the specific type of processing executed at the second arithmetic processing unit includes processing related to road guidance that contains current-position-detection processing with GPS signals," and that "the another type of processing executed at the first arithmetic processing unit includes at least either arithmetic processing for displaying a road map at the display unit or arithmetic processing for a route search," as recited in claim 1.

Sekiyama discloses an information processing apparatus 10 which is mounted in a vehicle, and a portable terminal device 22 which together provide a navigation function. The portable terminal 22 communicates with the information processing apparatus 10 when placed in a cradle, and shows route data on its display. The portable terminal 22 can be removed from the cradle and the user can view a map of the vicinity of the destination, which was previously downloaded from the information processing apparatus 10 while connected. (Abstract).

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action states that Sekiyama's information processing device 10 corresponds to the display device of the Applicant's claim 1, and that Sekiyama's portable terminal 22 corresponds to the external information processing apparatus recited in Applicant's claim 1. However, there is no disclosure by Sekiyama that processing is divided up between Sekiyama's information processing device 10 and portable terminal 22, as is done by the display device and information processing apparatus of claim 1. For example, Sekiyama's portable terminal 22 does not provide "current-position-detection processing with GPS signals" as does the second arithmetic processing unit of the external information processing apparatus of claim 1. As can be seen in Sekiyama's fig. 1, the processing of GPS signals is done in the information processing device 10, which contains a GPS receiver, rather than by the portable terminal 22.

In addition, there is no disclosure in Sekiyama that the information processing device 10 is used to display maps as is done by the first arithmetic processing unit in the display unit of claim 1. While Sekiyama's information processing device 10 can have a display 14, there is no discussion as to what the purpose is for display 14, and specifically there is no disclosure by Sekiyama of display 14 being used to display a map. As stated by Sekiyama, "a main display screen for the on-vehicle information device 10 is provided in the portable terminal 22." (Col. 4, lines 23-29).

Because Sekiyama does not disclose that "the specific type of processing executed at the second arithmetic processing unit includes processing related to road guidance that contains current-position-detection processing with GPS signals," and that "the another type of processing executed at the first arithmetic processing unit includes at least either arithmetic processing for displaying a road map at the display unit or arithmetic processing for a route search," as recited in claim 1, Sekiyama does not anticipate Applicant's claim 1.

Applicant's claim 2, as amended, and new claim 18 also recite that "the second arithmetic processing unit includes processing related to road guidance that contains current-position-detection processing with GPS signals," and that "the first arithmetic processing unit includes at least either arithmetic processing for displaying a road map at the display unit or arithmetic processing for a route search." Therefore, for reasons similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1, Applicant's claims 2 and 18 are patentably distinguishable over Sekiyama.

Applicant's claims 6-8, 10, 12 and 19 variously depend from independent claims 1, 2 and 18, and therefore are patentably distinguishable over Sekiyama for at least those reasons stated above with regard to claims 1, 2 and 18.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10 and 12 as allegedly anticipated by Sekiyama be withdrawn.

New independent claim 14 recites "a second information processing apparatus," wherein the interface unit of the display device can be connected with the second information processing apparatus. Because there is no corresponding disclosure in Sekiyama of a second portable terminal that interfaces with the information processing device, Sekiyama does not disclose all the elements of claim 14. Therefore, for at least this reason, new claims 14-17 are patentable over Sekiyama

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Sekiyama. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Applicant's claim 18 is patentable over Sekiyama. Claim 8, as amended, depends from claim 18, and therefore, for at least those reason discussed above with regard to claim 18, Sekiyama also does not render claim 8 unpatentable. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

All outstanding objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition of allowance.

Notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #029267.55527US).

Respectfully submitted,

February 2, 2006

Stephen W. Palan
Registration No. 43,420

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
SWP:AJH/lbd
dn#2706727